

EVALUATION PHASE

7.0 7.1 Initial Screening

Ideas generated during the Speculation Phase were not subject to any evaluation. This is done to promote free thinking. The next step was the initial screening of ideas, which was used to identify real and potential conflicts and to consider the likelihood for acceptance of each idea. In addition, ideas that violated project constraints were eliminated. The initial screening used a pass-fail technique. Ideas that passed the initial screening are indicated with a "P" for *pass*, and those that failed are indicated with an "F" for *fail* in column 1 of Exhibit 7.1, which shows the results of the initial screening process.

7.2 Checkpoint Presentation

The ideas were presented to MDOT on March 4, 2004, at the Checkpoint Presentation. MDOT's responses to the ideas are listed in column 2 on Exhibit 7.1. Ideas that were acceptable to carry forward are indicated with an "A" for *accept* and those ideas that were rejected, for various reasons, are indicated with a "R" for *reject*. Exhibit 7.2 is the list of meeting attendees. At this meeting, all the ideas were presented to MDOT. At the end of the meeting, MDOT furnished the VE team the promised newsletter on this project detailing the eleven commitments MDOT made to the City of Detroit (Exhibit 7.3).

Based on Friday's comments, the list of ideas was further screened. The list of ideas accepted by MDOT is presented in Exhibit 7.4. Exhibit 7.5 is the meeting minutes of the Checkpoint Presentation.

7.3 Rating

The team further rated all the accepted ideas. Each idea was given a rating on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the highest rating. Ideas that are considerations for the original designer are indicated as "DC" for *design consideration*. These are shown in column 3 of Exhibit 7.1

Screening

Creativity Phase Composite Summary-Speculation		Initial Screening	MDOT Responses	Rating
Idea No.	Description			
1.	Use alternative types of retaining walls to minimize excavation: (a) Secant pile (b) Tied-back steel sheeting (c) Helical anchor tied back (d) Soldier pile and lagging (e) MSE in fill sections (f) Vertical face, cast-in-place concrete (g) Crib walls (h) Slope paving, say 1:1	P	A	DC
2.	Use retaining walls instead of grading to save right of way.	P	A	DC
3.	Use slopes instead of retaining walls where right of way is available.	P	A	DC
4.	Eliminate 8 ft. shoulder on 2- or 3-lane service drives, throughout project.	P	A	DC
5.	Eliminate 8 ft. shoulder on service drives through interchange areas.	F		
6.	Eliminate 8 ft. shoulder on service drives, and build bus turnouts.	P	R	
7.	Eliminate/terminate service drives through two system interchanges.	P	R	
8.	Construct one service drive carrying two-way traffic, for entire project.	F		
9.	Build 24 ft. service drive (16'+8'), single lane, west of M-10 and at east end of project.	P	R	
10.	Eliminate/terminate north-south service drives through M-10 and I-75 Interchanges.	P	R	
11.	Use Harper as a westbound service drive west of I-75.	P	R	
12.	Purchase right of way for entire footprint, but build frontage roads as demand requires.	F		
13.	Use Harper as a westbound service drive at east end of project.	P	R	
14.	Connect Harper to service drive west of Frontenac.	P	A	7
15.	Eliminate service drive in northeast quadrant of I-75 Interchange, by using East Grand Blvd. and Milwaukee.	P	R	
16.	Use a service road "perimeter system" at the two system interchanges.	P	A	9
17.	Near GM, integrate East Grand Blvd. into service drive.	P	A	5
18.	Shift eastbound service drive alignment at Mt. Elliott to parallel mainline.	P	A	8
19.	In northeast quadrant of I-75 Interchange, relocate service drive to former railroad corridor.	P	R	

P = Pass
F = Fail
A = Accepted for Study

R = Rejected
DC= Design Consideration
PD= Project Design

Screening (continued)

Creativity Phase Composite Summary-Speculation		Initial Screening	MDOT Responses	Rating
Idea No.	Description			
20.	For service drives, use existing streets adjacent to system interchanges.	P	R	
21.	In northeast quadrant of M-10 Interchange, put service drive on Antoinette and Holden.	P	R	
22.	Terminate service drives as T-intersection in interchanges.	F		
23.	In southeast quadrant of M-10 Interchange, relocate service drive to Palmer.	F		
24.	Use at-grade crossings for service drives at railroads (at specific locations).	P	R	
25.	Grade separate service drives at the railroads (at specific locations).	P	PD	
26.	Create collector-distributor road system at interchanges, and tie service drives into the collector-distributor roads.	P	R	
27.	Construct single two-way service road only at M-10 and I-75 Interchanges.	F		
28.	Eliminate third lane on eastbound service drive at Wayne State University.	P	R	
29.	Minimize green space between service drives and mainline, to minimize real estate, wherever possible.	P	A	4
30.	Slope service roads to the outside.	DC		
31.	For service drives, use two-lane cross section through intersections instead of three lanes at slip ramps.	F		
32.	Review proposed traffic signal locations on service roads; some don't seem warranted.	P	A	9
33.	At east end of project, design service drives for future extension.	DC		
34.	Use 12 ft. median shoulders for I-94 mainline, instead of 14 ft.	P	A	9
35.	Use 10 ft. median shoulders for I-94 mainline, instead of 14 ft.	P	R	
36.	Use four-foot-wide median barrier, constant width, to accommodate bridge piers, sign bridges, etc.	P	A	9
37.	Use minimum width (2'-4") for the median barrier, instead of 14 ft. and widen for bridge piers, sign bridges, etc.	P	A	5
38.	For I-94, do not pave the earth median where proposed, but use double-faced guardrail.	F		
39.	Minimize center median width to stay within the existing right of way.	F		
40.	Use wider median to accommodate sight distance only (on curves).	P	A	4
41.	Restrict trucks to outside lanes, to use thinner pavement on inside lanes.	F		
42.	Use wider outside lane or lanes for trucks (12'-6" or 13').	DC		
43.	Pave full depth 14 ft. outside lane, use two feet for shoulder and stripe lane for 12 ft.	DC		

P = Pass

F = Fail

A = Accepted for Study

R = Rejected

DC= Design Consideration

PD= Project Design

Exhibit 7.1
Page 2 of 5

Screening (continued)

Creativity Phase Composite Summary-Speculation		Initial Screening	MDOT Responses	Rating
Idea No.	Description			
44.	Use long-life European style pavement.	DC		
45.	Use hot-mixed asphalt (HMA) full depth perpetual pavement.	DC		
46.	Use continuously reinforced concrete (CRC) pavement.	DC	R	
47.	Design mainline shoulders as full pavement section.	DC		
48.	Use inside shoulder for peak hour HOV lane.	F		
49.	Use reversible lanes on I-94, in addition to 4 lanes.	F		
50.	Use valley-gutter curb instead of concrete barrier at retaining walls.	P	A	9
51.	Set profile grade line at centerline.	DC		
52.	Set independent profiles to eliminate differential height median barrier (if PGL is away from roadway centerline).	DC		
53.	Shift I-94 centerline north between Rosa Park and Woodward.	P	A	8
54.	At Mt. Elliott, flatten I-94 curvature, spread out ramp terminals; eliminate design exceptions.	P	A	3
55.	Eliminate exit and entrance ramps at Chene.	P	R	
56.	For low volume system interchange exit ramps, construct single lane exit ramps instead of dual lane.	P	A	7
57.	At I-75, construct 2-lane exit ramps for eastbound and westbound I-94 to I-75 northbound and southbound, instead of successive exits.	P	A	5
58.	Tie ramps into Woodward instead of Brush.	P	R	
59.	Use collector-distributor road system between Chene and I-75.	P	A	7
60.	For M-10 south of I-94, do not reconstruct south of Warren, except for removal of two ramps immediately south of Warren.	P	R	DC
61.	Construct single point interchanges at the following locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conner• Gratiot• Van Dyke• Mt. Elliott• Woodward (possibly)	P F F F F	A	2
62.	For southbound I-75 movement to service drive, move exit out of interchange.	P	A	5
63.	Use split diamond interchange between Van Dyke and Gratiot.	P	R	
64.	For Dequindre Bridge, widen north side only; for exit to Chene, use single lane instead of two.	P	A	7

P = Pass

F = Fail

A = Accepted for Study

R = Rejected

DC= Design Consideration

PD= Project Design

Exhibit 7.1
Page 3 of 5

7.0
EVALUATION
PHASE

Exhibit 7.1

Screening (continued)

Creativity Phase Composite Summary-Speculation		Initial Screening	MDOT Responses	Rating
Idea No.	Description			
65.	Remove Dequindre Bridge to provide only required roadway clearance, which helps profiles for structures if required in I-75 Interchange.	F		
66.	Eliminate Cass Street Bridge.	F		
67.	Eliminate Concord Street Bridge (or Frontenac).	P	R	
68.	Eliminate Chene Street Bridge.	P	R	
69.	Eliminate Cadillac Street Bridge.	P	R	
70.	Eliminate Linwood Street Bridge; combine U-turn movement with Grand River Bridge.	P	R	
71.	Eliminate Iroquis and Rohns pedestrian bridges, if Burns remains.	P	R	
72.	Eliminate Helen Street pedestrian bridge.	P	R	
73.	At Gratiot, move U-turn structure west of the bridge.	P	R	
74.	Eliminate all U-turn structures, and eliminate U-turn roadway on structures that have them.	P	A	2
75.	Eliminate all pedestrian bridges, but accommodate pedestrians on roadway bridges.	P	R	
76.	Use cable-stayed pedestrian bridges.	DC		
77.	For two pedestrian bridges at Wayne State University, work with the University to incorporate new structures as part of context sensitive design.	DC		
78.	Eliminate pedestrian bridge over I-94 at Wayne State, but widen Trumbull Bridge for sidewalks.	P	R	
79.	Shorten pedestrian bridges to touch down between service drives and mainline; add pedestrian crossing signal.	P	A	7
80.	Install underpasses for pedestrians.	F		
81.	Design pedestrian bridges to span service drives.	PD		
82.	Eliminate U-turn between East Grand Boulevard and Chene; reconfigure Chene intersection.	P	A	5
83.	For CN railroad bridges at west end of project, build one bridge instead of two.	P	A	7
84.	Review placement of piers for bridges in I-75 and M-10 Interchanges to determine if span lengths and geometry affect right of way footprint.	DC		
85.	Instead of pump stations, micro tunnel to river for drainage.			
A.	Separate I-94 corridor storm water from city combined system.	DC		
B.	Use abandoned railroad corridor for new trunk sewer outfall to river.	DC		

P = Pass

F = Fail

A = Accepted for Study

R = Rejected

DC= Design Consideration

PD= Project Design

Exhibit 7.1
Page 4 of 5

Exhibit 7.1

Screening (continued)

Creativity Phase Composite Summary-Speculation		Initial Screening	MDOT Responses	Rating
Idea No.	Description			
86.	Use retaining walls in northeast quadrant for I-75 Interchange.	P	A	7
87.	Locate opportunities throughout the corridor for areas to use waste material, i.e. earth berms.	DC		
88.	Close interchange ramps as necessary in opposite movement pairs (detour ramp movements to adjacent interchange).	DC		
89.	Explore construction staging alternatives. Consider capacity of contractors to be able to build segments.	DC		
90.	For frontage roads at Dequindre Bridge, build on embankment (1 or 2 ft.) to avoid contaminated material.	DC		
91.	Provide advanced notice to contracting industry for new technologies materials and construction techniques.	DC		

P = Pass
F = Fail
A = Accepted for Study

R = Rejected
DC= Design Consideration
PD= Project Design

I-94 Reconstruction from I-96 to Conner
Presentation of Ideas

Meeting Attendance Record
March 4, 2004 - 1:00 pm

Name	Organization	Phone Number	E-Mail Address
Danrell Berry	Bloom Consultants (HNTB)	414-771-3390, Ext 251	dberry@bloomconsultants.com
BILL SWAGLER	M-DOT REAL ESTATE	(517) 373-9179	SWAGLERW@MI.GOV
Tom JAY	MDOT REAL ESTATE	(248) 483-5168	JAYT@MICHIGAN.GOV
Sue Datta	MDOT Metro	248 483 5135	dattas@michigan.gov
William Land	MDOT Planning	(517) 241-3677	landb@michigan.gov
Michael D'Malley	MDOT - Environmental	517.335.2634	dmdalley@michigan.gov
WIN STEBBINS	MDOT Design	517 373-2246	stebbinsw@michigan.gov
Bill Carley	CH2M HILL	517.347.3132 ext 22	bcarley@ch2m.com
STEVE RAPP	MDOT - DESIGN, RR COORD.	517-335-3043	rapps@michigan.gov
Tony Kratoch	MDOT METRO REGION	248-483-5102	kratochit@michigan.gov
Al Kattortule	Benesch	517 482 1682	akattortule@benesch.com
MOHAMMED ALGHURABI	MDOT	(517) 313-7674	ALGHURABI.M@MICHIGAN.GOV
Doug Strauss	Benesch	517 482 1682	dstrauss@benesch.com
MUTHIAH KASI	BENESCH	312 565 0450	kasi@benesch.com
BRENDAN J. PERU	MDOT - COMMUNICATIONS	248-483-5109	Perub@michigan.gov
Andy Zeigler	MDOT - Metro Region	248-483-5108	ZeiglerA@michigan.gov

I-94 Reconstruction from I-96 to Conner
Presentation of Ideas

Meeting Attendance Record
March 4, 2004 - 1:00 pm

Greg Johnson MDOT-METRO 248 483-5100 JohnsonG2@Michigan.gov

Name	Organization	Phone Number	E-Mail Address
Terry Horst	HNTB	414.359.2300 x2063	thorst@hntb.com
Laura Aylsworth-Bonzelet	URS	231-932-7592 x224	laura-aylsworth@urscorp.com
KHALED SOUBRA	URS	248.994.7447	khaled_soubra@urscorp.com
STEVE FLEMING	PBQD	317-972-1706	FLEMINGSC@PBWORLD.COM
PAUL SANDER	MDOT	248-483-5153	SANDERPA@michigan.gov
Barb Arens	PB	313-963-4651	arens@pbworld.com
Lisa Solomon	PB	313-963-3273	solomnaL@pbworld.com
STEVE NADALIS	PB	313 963 3272	NADALIS@PBWORLD.COM
Ed STRADA	HNTB	313-961-3330 x5758	estrada@hntb.com
Bill Stonebrook	MDOT	517-373-2281	stonebrookb@michigan.gov
BILL LAMBDAIN	HNTB	313/961-3330 x5760	blambdain@hntb.com
KEVIN MULLINS	BENESCH	517/482-1682	kmullins@benesch.com
JOHN FRIEL	HNTB	313-961-3330 x5753	jfriel@hntb.com
Rich Hill	BENESCH	312-565-0450	rhill@benesch.com
PETER KINNEY	HNTB	(313) 961-3330	PKINNEY@HNTB.COM
Cedric Dargatz	MDOT	248-483-5172	dargatz@michigan.gov
RITA D. SCREWS	MDOT - DETROIT TSC	313-965-6350 EXT. 401	screwsr@michigan.gov
Ruth Hepter	FWHA	517/702-1833	ruth.hepter@fwwa.dot.gov
LINDA LYWOOD	MDOT	517.313.0026	lywoodl@michigan.gov
Marge Lauer	PB	517-327-7045	lauer@pbworld.com

Exhibit 7.2

I-94 Rehabilitation Project

(east of I-96 to Conner Avenue)

Newsletter

The I-94 Rehabilitation Project includes a limited-access transportation corridor that begins east of the I-96 interchange and ends east of Conner Avenue. This area encompasses major freeway-to-freeway interchanges with M-10 and I-75, and is adjacent to the I-96 interchange.

The I-94 Rehabilitation Project was initiated by the Michigan Department of Transportation in 1994 and is currently in the final environmental documentation phase. See pages 2 and 3 for more information on the project's background and next steps.

Special point of interest:

As part of continued community outreach, Public Information Meetings will be held on October 21, 2003 at the Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History and Wayne County Community College on October 22, 2003. Members of the community are welcomed between 3:30 PM and 7:30 PM each day. See page 3 for more details.

Inside this issue:

Project Background	2
Need for the Project	2
History of Project Activities	2
Evaluation of Alternatives and Selection of a Recommended Alternative	3
Summary of Recommended Alternative Benefits	3
Next Steps	3
City Council Approves Recommended Alternative (cont.)	4

City Council and Mayor's Office Approve Recommended Alternative

On August 1, 2003, the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) presented its current plans for I-94 to the Detroit City Council. MDOT received unanimous votes of approval from the City Council to move forward with the project's Recommended Alternative with a joint legislative and executive "Resolution of Support". The "Resolution of Support" was officially approved by the Mayor's office on August 12, 2003 and published in the Detroit Legal News on August 14, 2003.

The Detroit Legal News article described that the City Council, in 2001, had passed a resolution with 11 changes to the Build Alternative included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It reported that since 2001, "the design of the freeway has continued to evolve and your Honorable Body's comments have been taken into account. CPC (City Planning Commission) staff has attended several meetings with MDOT and its consultants and, most recently, representatives from the Mayor's office, DPW (Department of Public Works) and DDOT (Detroit Department of Transportation). The most recent iteration of the design, as described in the 'I-94 Rehabilitation Project Recommended

Alternative Analysis Final Report,' appears to substantially address the concerns raised in your previous resolution." (Detroit Legal News, 8/14/03)

The following summarizes how each of the 11 changes requested by the City Council are being addressed:

1. The 55-foot reserved median space has been removed as requested.
2. To address the width of continuous service drives, 2-lanes with an 8-foot shoulder will be provided. Based on 2025 traffic demand, 3-lanes on the east-bound service drive between M-10 and I-75 will be provided.
3. Hendrie Street access has been redesigned to address the request for the addition of a street east of Woodward and parallel to the service drive for local traffic in order to protect the residences along Hendrie Street.
4. MDOT clarified documentation of the project limits and an Environmental Assessment will not be included as part of the project.
5. The project's EIS includes the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Study's impact on truck traffic as requested.
6. In the preliminary design, MDOT has reduced spacing between the auxiliary lanes and mainline lanes as much as possible and has 'tightened' ramp geometrics in order to limit the taking of private property. Further efforts to address these concerns will be undertaken in final design.
7. In response to the issue of special consideration of schools regarding noise mitigation, MDOT will address noise mitigation according to FHWA guidelines.
8. In response to the request of using rapid transit as a traffic construction mitigation component, through flexible TEA 21 funding in the corridor, MDOT is considering construction mitigation funding for buses. There are currently no rail alternatives to I-94 that have been identified by SEMCOG.

(Continued on Page 4)



For More Information Contact:
<http://www.mdot.state.mi.us/I94rehab>
or (313) 963-4655

I-94 REHABILITATION PROJECT NEWSLETTER

City Council and Mayor's Office Approve Recommended Alternative (continued)

9. Regarding the issue of correction of existing noise and air quality violations, MDOT will correct existing air and noise quality violations according to FHWA guidelines.
 10. Regarding the issue of securing all funding for noise barriers — walls, landscaping, buffering, etc. — as well as funding for modifications of streets intersecting the service drives and on-going maintenance of the barrier walls before any highway approvals are given, MDOT clarified that memorandums of understanding will be developed between the City and MDOT describing funding share and exact maintenance responsibilities.
 11. The railroad right-of-way east of I-75 and south of I-94 will remain as a rail corridor. Rail for the region is currently being addressed in separate studies.
- As the project moves forward with the Recommended Alternative, further meetings with the City of Detroit, project stakeholders, and the public will occur as part of the project.

7.0
EVALUATION
PHASE

7.4 Ideas Accepted by MDOT at Checkpoint Presentation

Idea No.	Description	Rating
1.	Use alternative types of retaining walls to minimize excavation:	DC
(a)	Secant pile	
(b)	Tied-back steel sheeting	
(c)	Helical anchor tied back	
(d)	Soldier pile and lagging	
(e)	MSE in fill sections	
(f)	Vertical face, cast-in-place concrete	
(g)	Crib walls	
(h)	Slope paving, say 1:1	
2.	Use retaining walls instead of grading to save right-of-way.	DC
4.	Eliminate 8 ft. shoulder on two- or three-lane service drives, throughout project.	DC
14.	Connect Harper to service drive west of Frontenac.	7
16.	Use a service road "perimeter system" at the two system interchanges.	9
17.	Near GM, integrate East Grand Blvd. into service drive.	5
18.	Shift eastbound service drive alignment at Mt. Elliott to parallel mainline.	8
29.	Minimize green space between service drives and mainline, to minimize real estate, wherever possible.	4
32.	Review proposed traffic signal locations on service roads; some don't seem warranted.	9
34.	Use 12 ft. median shoulders for I-94 mainline, instead of 14 ft.	9
36.	Use 4-ft.-wide median barrier, constant width, to accommodate bridge piers, sign bridges, etc.	9
37.	Use minimum width (2'-4") for the median barrier where proposed instead of 14 ft. and widen for bridge piers, sign bridges, etc.	5
40.	Use wider median to accommodate sight distance only (on curves).	4
50.	Use valley-gutter curb instead of concrete barrier	

Idea No.	Description	Rating
	at retaining walls.	9
53.	Shift I-94 centerline north between Rosa Park and Woodward.	8
54.	At Mt. Elliott, flatten I-94 curvature, spread out ramp terminals; eliminate design exceptions.	3
56.	For low volume system interchange exit ramps, construct single lane exit ramps instead of dual lane.	7
57.	At I-75, construct 2-lane exit ramps for eastbound and westbound I-94 to I-75 northbound and southbound, instead of successive exits.	5
59.	Use collector-distributor road system between Chene and I-75.	7
60.	For M-10 south of I-94, do not reconstruct south of Warren, except for removal of two ramps immediately south of Warren.	DC
61.	Construct single point interchanges at the following locations:	
	Conner	2
62.	For southbound I-75 movement to service drive, move exit out of interchange.	5
64.	For Dequindre Bridge, widen north side only; for exit to Chene, use single lane instead of two.	7
74.	Eliminate all U-turn structures, and eliminate U-turn roadway on structures that have them.	2
79.	Shorten pedestrian bridges to touch down between service drives and mainline; add pedestrian crossing signal.	7
82.	Eliminate U-turn between East Grand Boulevard and Chene; Reconfigure Chene intersection.	5
83.	For CN railroad bridges at west end of project, build one bridge instead of two.	7
86.	Use retaining walls in northeast quadrant for I-75 interchange.	7

DC = Design Consideration

R = Reject

Exhibit 7.4

MEETING MINUTES

Date of Meeting: March 4, 2004
Time of Meeting: 1:00 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.
Meeting Location: Marriott Courtyard - Detroit

Subject: I-94 EPE Reconstruction I-96 to Conner Avenue
Value Engineering Study
Check Point Review of Ideas – Session 1

Participants: An attendance roster is attached.
Agenda: An Agenda is attached.

This meeting was held for the VE team to present initial ideas from Session 1 to MDOT staff, and for MDOT staff to give comments on those ideas. The meeting was considered as a check point review. Following are notes from the meeting:

- Win Stebbins: Introduction.
- Kasi: PowerPoint presentation
 - Review of VE Process
 - Review of Cost Estimate
- Kasi requested that answers/clarification on estimates be provided next week.
- One third of cost is service drive and cross structures.
- Darrell covered 21 questions regarding cost estimate.
- Kasi covered Function Cost Components.
- Kasi reviewed how to look at value vs. mismatch.
- Darrell talked about the VE process
 - Needs/Desires/Constraints
 - Owners/Users/Stakeholders
 - Speculation, two teams developed and then came together to combine ideas into one list.
- Laura presented ideas 1-33, service drives.
- Terry presented ideas 34-63, mainline.
- Al presented ideas 64-84, bridges
- Marge presented ideas 85-91, drainage/construction staging.
- Darrell gave a summary of our work thus far.
- Darrell reviewed how project cost was developed
- Kasi gave examples
 - Contingency: What is included? Earthwork?
 - Enhancement: What is included? How is it broken down between mainline and service drives?

- Darrell –cost estimate was done in 2001 and updated with factors to 2002 dollars. Cost estimate has not been updated to 2004 dollars.
 - VE Estimate Structures \$420 million. DEIS estimated cost is \$161 million. When all the various factors from the original cost estimate are combined, the multiplier on construction cost becomes 2.63.
 - Suggest using a factor of 1.50 on construction costs for bridges, and also for retaining walls.
 - Multiplier would be based on:
 - ◆ Mobilization Costs
 - ◆ Maintenance of Traffic
 - ◆ Construction Engineering Costs
 - ◆ Design Engineering Costs
 - ◆ Contingencies
- Win Stebbins
 - Gave the VE team some parameters (11 items) that were not known to the I-94 VE team when developing the list of VE Ideas. The information given was an October 2003 Newsletter. The VE team listed MDOT's comments on each of the ideas presented (see following pages).

Mohammed stated that he expects the VE team to validate the project right-of-way footprint, so that there is no delay in the environmental process. If elements of the proposed design cannot be validated, reasons need to be given.

Notes: The 6' median width has no justification. Planning tool variable
Railroad bridges should be in cost model.
South Lodge work is not part of cost estimate
Elimination of Brush Street ramps may be a City Issue.
VE team to identify drainage issues and cost.

The above constitutes my understanding of the issues discussed and the conclusions reached.

Respectfully submitted,
Douglass Strauss
Project Manager

7.0 EVALUATION PHASE

7.0 EVALUATION PHASE

List of the Ideas and MDOT's Comments on the Ideas: (Refer to Section 6.0 for a listing of the ideas)

1. OK
2. OK
3. OK - maintenance is an issue with MDOT. Getting to these grass areas for mowing. Identify slope 1:3 or 1:4 and material.
4. Rejected – City wanted flexibility. Wanted 12' shoulder for future changes
5. Failed by VE team; additional information indicated that this is the current design.
6. Rejected - per commitment to City
7. Rejected - Has to be continuous service drive per commitment with City/public
8. Failed by VE team
9. Rejected - Need 30' per City functionality free flow transit non-motorist traffic.
10. Rejected – Commitments to public. Must have continuous service drive.
11. Rejected - Commitments to public. Must have continuous service drive.
12. Failed by VE team.
13. Rejected - Commitments to public. Must have continuous service drive.
14. OK – Right in/Right out only
15. Rejected - Commitments to public. Must have continuous service drive.
16. Accepted – Project had it at one time but PB was told it was too costly.
17. Accepted – GM needs separate service drive. Keep access points for GM to/ from I-94
18. Accepted
19. Rejected – Must have continuous service drive.
20. Rejected – Must have continuous service drive (similar to Idea #7).
21. Rejected – Must have continuous service drive.
22. Failed by VE team
23. Failed by VE team
24. Rejected – Service drives are all being grade separated. Follow mainline. FHWA wants separated.
25. Current design
26. Rejected – PB already studied this along with braded ramps and service drive chosen
27. Failed by VE team
28. Rejected – Agreement reasons with Wayne State University
29. Accepted - limit areas if cantilever. Enhance extra areas. Must have a specific benefit on other side of service drive.
30. Design Consideration
31. Failed by VE team
32. Accepted
33. Design Consideration
34. Accepted - MDOT and FHWA want to see cost implications
35. Rejected
36. Accepted - can study-prepare cost
37. Accepted - can study-prepare cost
38. Failed by VE team
39. Failed by VE team
40. Accepted – Stay within footprint
41. Failed by VE team
42. Design Consideration
43. Design Consideration
44. Design Consideration
45. Design Consideration
46. Rejected – No CRC pavement per MDOT
47. Design Consideration
48. Failed by VE team
49. Failed by VE team
50. Accepted
51. Design Consideration
52. Design Consideration
53. Accepted – stay within footprint
54. Accepted – Failed by VE team after meeting, goes outside footprint
55. Rejected – Per GM agreement
56. Accepted
57. Accepted – First one takes off first due to profile.
58. Rejected – Tight spacing. Moved to Brush because of ramp spacing from M-10 ramps. Maintain existing access patterns.
59. Accepted, although already studied by PB
60. Rejected – Changed to Design Consideration by VE team. It is because needed to extend ramp to avoid design exceptions. Part of Access Justification Report (AJR)
61. Accepted – If stays in footprint, also look at Gratiot.
62. Accepted – If ramp spacing is met
63. Rejected
64. Accepted – stay in footprint. Current design is to widen to north.
65. Failed by VE team
66. Failed by VE team
67. Rejected – If it eliminates pedestrian need to describe where pedestrians will go. Who is benefiting, plus commitment to City to put back as many as possible.
68. Rejected – If it eliminates pedestrian need to describe where pedestrians will go. Who is benefiting, plus commitment to City to put back as many as possible.
69. benefiting plus commitment to City to put back as many as possible.
70. Rejected – For transit use
71. Rejected – For transit use

7.0
EVALUATION
PHASE

- 72. Rejected – Pedestrian bridge must remain
- 73. Rejected – Need strong case. Transit is an issue
- 74. Accepted
- 75. Rejected – pedestrian bridges must remain
- 76. Design Consideration
- 77. Design Consideration
- 78. Rejected – This is the proposed design. Brooklyn & Canfield pedestrian bridges are the only ones to be out.
- 79. Accepted – City concerned about pedestrian traffic
- 80. Failed by VE team
- 81. Current design
- 82. Accepted – Maintain movements to GM
- 83. Accepted – VE team to prepare cost comparison
- 84. Design Consideration
- 85. Design Consideration.
 - a. Design Consideration
 - b. Design Consideration
- 86. Accepted
- 87. Design Consideration
- 88. Design Consideration
- 89. Design Consideration
- 90. Design Consideration
- 91. Design Consideration